REMARKS

In the Official Action, the Examiner raised a single rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of all of the claims 1-3 and 5-14 based on Van Loon, U.S. Patent No. 6,503,637.

By the present Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to define certain aspects of the present invention with greater precision by including the subject matter of claims 7, 8 and 10 and such claims, along with claims 6, 13 and 14, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New dependent claims 15 and 16 have been added to define further aspects of the invention as supported by the specification, such as at page 3, lines 21-22, and Examples 1 and 10.

As recited in claim 1, one aspect of the present invention provides a heat-sealable laminated film obtained by laminating a substrate layer on one surface of a heat-sealable film comprising a resin composition having an easy-openable property directly or through a laminated layer, wherein the resin composition comprises an ethylene polymer composition (D) comprising 5 to 65 wt% of a propylene polymer (A), 1 to 35 wt% of an ethylene/α-olefin random copolymer (B) having a density of less than 895 kg/m^3 and 10 to 85 wt% of an ethylene polymer (C) selected from the group consisting of (a) a linear low density polyethylene having a density of 895 to 925 kg/m^3 prepared by using a catalyst containing a metallocene compound of a transition metal and (b) a high density polyethylene having a density of greater than 940 kg/m^3 and up to 970 kg/m^3 (in a total amount of 100 wt%).

It will be noted from the discussion provided on pages 17-20 that the illustrative Examples provide laminated films and exhibit the benefits which can be obtained in accordance with the present invention. For instance, Table 1 on page 18

of the specification shows that when one follows the teachings of the present invention, good peeling can be obtained. However, when one of the recited ingredients is omitted, as in Comparative Example 3, or when the recited amounts of the components are not present as in Comparative Example 4, inferior peeling occurs.

Van Loon relates to films made of a blend of certain components, but is not directed towards achieving improved peelability. Instead, the patent seeks to obtain moisture impermeability and good sealability. In particular, Van Loon discloses a film comprising a blend of i) a homopolymer of ethylene or a copolymer of ethylene and up to 50% of a C_3-C_{20} olefin, ii) a homopolymer of propylene or a copolymer of propylene and up to 50% weight percent of a comonomer selected from the group consisting of ethylene and C_4-C_{20} α-olefins, and iii) a polymer produced in a high pressure process using a free radical initiator. As disclosed in the passage beginning at column 4, line 24, the high pressure polymer can be a low density polyethylene having a density of 0.91 to less than 0.94 g/cm^3.

The Examiner has now conceded that the film of Van Loon does not meet ethylene polymer composition recited in the former claims on page 4 of the Official Action. In an attempt to meet this significant deficiency, the Examiner has relied on the paragraph at the top of column 5 which states:

> The blends described above can also further include other polymers such as polybutene, high density polyethylene (density 0.945 to less than 0.98 g/cm^3) linear low density polyethylene, medium density polyethylene (density 0.935 to less than 0.945 g/cm^3), polyvinylchloride, isotactic polybutene, ABS resins, elastomers such as ethylene-propylene rubber (EPR), vulcanized EPR, EPDM, block copolymer elastomers such as SBS, nylons, polycarbonates, PET resins, crosslinked polyethylene, copolymers of ethylene and vinyl alcohol (EVOH), polymers of aromatic monomers such as polystyrene, poly-1 esters, graft copolymers generally, polyacrylonitrile

homopolymer or copolymers, thermoplastic polyamides, polyacetal, polyvinylidine fluoride and other fluorinated elastomers, polyethylene glycols and polyisobutylene.

Absent improper resort to applicants' own specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would not select only those materials that meet the recitation of component (C) of claim 1. There is nothing in Van Loon which would lead to only the claimed materials from the extensive list provided in column 5. Moreover, one would not use such disclosed optional materials in an amount of 10 to 85 wt% since various of the required components are present in the illustrative Examples in amounts of only 5 or 10 wt% (see the Tables starting at column 10). Thus, for instance, if one considers the third and fourth blends in Table 1 which contain 5 wt% of low density polyethylene, applicants respectfully submit that it would not be obvious to use at least twice this amount of a **high** density polyethylene or linear low density polyethylene.

Furthermore, Van Loon does not recognize that by following the teachings of the present invention, the noted substantial advantages can be obtained, including good peelability, that are demonstrated in the illustrative Examples. In this regard, the patent does not remotely recognize the feature now recited in new claim 16 that cohesive peeling of the heat-sealable laminated film can be attained. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the claims now of record are fully patentable over the fair teachings of Van Loon and accordingly request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the subject application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

By: _____
Robert G. Mukai
Registration No. 28,531

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: June 8, 2009